UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,026	12/14/2001	Glenn Darrell Batalden	ROC920010306US1	8987

7590 07/29/2004

Gero G. McClellan
Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P.
Suite 1500
3040 Post Oak Boulevard
Houston, TX 77056-6582

EXAMINER	
ZHOU, TING	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/020,026	BATALDEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ting Zhou	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 December 2001 is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the use of the phrase "received from received from" is grammatically incorrect. It is suggested that the phrase be changed to -- received from --. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

a. The use of the phrase "received from received from" on line5 of paragraph 0009 on page 3 is grammatically incorrect. It is suggested that the phrase be changed to -- received from --.

b. The use of "configured" on line 2 of paragraph 0005 on page 3 is grammatically incorrect. It is suggested that the phrase be changed to -- configure --.

c. The use of "disable our enable" on line 3 of paragraph 0005 on page 3 is grammatically incorrect. It is suggested that the phrase be changed to -- disable or enable --.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 26-30 and 32 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims incorrectly refer to "The computer of claim 15". Dependent claim 15 does not have a computer and therefore, the dependence of claims 26-30 and 32 on claim 15 is inappropriate. However, it

appears that the intended dependence of claims 26-30 and 32 is on -- The computer of claim 25 - -, therefore, for examination purposes, the Examiner will treat claims 26-30 and 32 as dependent upon independent claim 25. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 19 contains the trademark/trade name Netscape Navigator® and Microsoft Internet Explorer® on line 3. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe browser programs and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, 14-17, 19, 21-26 and 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Friskel et al. U.S. Patent 6,683,629.

Referring to claims 1, 14 and 25, Friskel et al. teach a method, computer readable medium and computer comprising a memory containing at least a browser programming (column 3, lines 4-34 and Figure 1), a processor (column 3, lines 4-19 and Figure 1) which when executing the browser programming is configured to open a controlling browser window configured to control aspects of a controlled browser window (a parent browser window comprising toolbar buttons used to control the information displayed in application browser windows and add-on browser windows) and open the controlled browser window comprising a display area for rendering viewable content received from network locations (displaying

information received from the Internet in the application browser window and add-on browser windows residing in the parent browser window) (column 4, lines 3-23 and 62-67, and column 9, lines 56-67). This is further shown in Figure 9, in which a parent browser window 900 is displayed and comprises application window 912, add-on child browser windows 902, 904 and 906 and toolbar buttons such as back, forward, etc. to control the information displayed.

Referring to claims 2 and 15, Friskel et al. teach the viewable content is Web content (displaying an URL webpage in the browser window) (column 4, lines 3-9 and Figure 9).

Referring to claims 3 and 17, Friskel et al. teach the aspects of the controlled browser window to be controlled by the controlling browser window comprise operational aspects and graphical aspects of a graphical user interface (for example, controlled child add-on windows comprises menus, icons, etc. that can be used to initiate functions and operations) (column 4, lines 9-17).

Referring to claims 5, 21 and 29, Friskel et al. teach opening the controlling browser window comprises opening a hidden window and wherein opening the controlled browser window comprises opening a viewable window (as can be seen from Figure 9, since the child windows are embedded within the parent window, it is the contents of the add-on child windows in the parent window and not the content of the parent window that are viewable).

Referring to claim 6, Friskel et al. teach the controlling browser window is opened prior to the controlled browser window and wherein the controlled browser window is opened from within the controlling browser window (for example, add-on programs are displayed in the controlling parent window in response to certain events such a launching or initiation of certain programs, the display of certain windows, etc.) (column 4, lines 18-44 and 62-67).

Referring to claim 7, Friskel et al. teach executing a browser control program comprising event handlers and re-establishing the event handlers for each change in a network address being accessed by the controlled browser program (the operating system executes an identification handle corresponding to each controlled window created; therefore, add-on child programs can be accessed when certain events occur) (column 4, lines 30-61 and column 6, lines 6-12).

Referring to claims 9, 22, and 30, Friskel et al. teach opening the controlling browser window comprises preventing at least a portion of the chrome of the controlled browser window from being displayed on an output device (the controlled child window is displayed embedded within the controlling parent window) (column 4, lines 62-67).

Referring to claims 10, 23 and 31, Friskel et al. teach the chrome of the controlled browser window comprises a menu bar (pull-down menu), title bar (header bar), a border (window border), etc. (column 4, lines 9-17, column 10, lines 1-6 and Figure 9).

Referring to claims 11 and 24, Friskel et al. teach the controlling browser window comprises at least one of a tool bar (toolbar icons shown at the top of the display), a menu bar ("File", "Edit", etc.), a title bar (such as "America Online"), a border (browser window border), etc., as shown in Figure 9.

Referring to claim 12, Friskel et al. teach opening the controlled browser window comprises executing a controlled browser program (child windows defined by the add-on program) and opening the controlling browser window comprises executing a controlling browser program (parent window defined by the application program) (column 2, lines 65-67).

Referring to claim 16, Friskel et al. teach the controlled browser window is opened from within the controlling browser window (the add-on child window is embedded within the parent browser window) (column 4, lines 62-67).

Referring to claim 19, Friskel et al. teach opening the controlled browser window comprises executing a controlled browser program selected from one of Netscape Navigator® and Microsoft Internet Explorer® (column 1, lines 30-33).

Referring to claim 26, Friskel et al. teach a Web browser (column 3, lines 25-30).

Referring to claim 32, Friskel et al. teach a network connection configured to support communications with the network locations via a network (interacting with external or remote computer servers via standard Internet communications protocols) (column 7, lines 7-10).

Referring to claim 33, Friskel et al. teach the network is the Internet (column 7, lines 7-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4, 20 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friskel et al. U.S. Patent 6,683,629, as applied to claims 1, 14 and 25 above, and further in view of Medoff U.S. Publication 2003/0088517.

Referring to claims 4, 20 and 28, Friskel et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to claims 1, 14 and 25 above. However, Friskel et al. fail to explicitly teach locking at least one of a keyboard key and a mouse key. Medoff teaches an interface for displaying information on a browser window, received from a network such as the Internet (Friskel et al.: paragraph 0006 on page 1), similar to that of Friskel et al. In addition, Medoff further teaches locking the keyboard keys (displaying a message on the browser that notifies the user that the keyboard keys are locked) (Medoff: paragraph 0081 on page 6 and Figure 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Friskel et al. and Medoff before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface for controlling a browser receiving information from a network of Friskel et al. to include the locking of the keys taught by Medoff. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to prevent users from performing unauthorized or unintended actions, limiting the printing and copying of private and secure information.

7. Claims 8, 13, 18 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friskel et al. U.S. Patent 6,683,629, as applied to claims 1, 14 and 25 above, and further in view of Hodgkinson U.S. Publication 2002/0016802.

Referring to claims 8, 18 and 27, Friskel et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to claims 1, 14 and 25 above. Specifically, Friskel et al. teach receiving user input to which the controlled browser program is configured to produce a response in a predetermined manner (for example, when the user clicks on an arrow using a mouse, the predetermined response is the add-on window rolls up into a header bar) (Friskel et al.: column 10, lines 1-6). However, Friskel et

al. fail to explicitly teach preventing the response in the predetermined manner and causing a response different from the predetermined manner. Hodgkinson teaches the display of user selected information received from a network such as the Internet (Hodgkinson: paragraphs 0001-0002 on page 1 and Figure 1), similar to that of Friskel et al. In addition, Hodgkinson further teaches receiving user input to which the controlled browser program is configured to produce a response in a predetermined manner, and executing the controlling browser program to prevent the response in the predetermined manner and cause a response different from the predetermined manner (upon receiving user selection requesting a change in the layout of the displayed webpage, instead of executing the change, the system prevents the browser from reformatting the pages) (Hodgkinson: paragraph 0015 on page 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Friskel et al. and Hodgkinson before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the control of a browser receiving information from a network of Friskel et al. to include the prevention of an action, taught by Hodgkinson. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to provide a management system that keeps users from conducting harmful or unauthorized actions on data, maintaining data integrity and security.

Referring to claim 13, Friskel et al. teach all of the limitations as applied to claims 1 and 12 above. However, Friskel et al. fail to explicitly teach, in response to receiving user input configured to produce a first action by the controlled browser program, executing the controlling browser program to override the first action and produce a second action. Hodgkinson teaches the display of user selected information received from a network such as the Internet (Hodgkinson: paragraphs 0001-0002 on page 1 and Figure 1), similar to that of Friskel et al. In

addition, Hodgkinson further teaches in response to receiving user input configured to produce a first action by the controlled browser program, executing the controlling browser program to override the first action and produce a second action (upon receiving user selection requesting a change in the layout of the displayed webpage, instead of executing the change, the system prevents the browser from reformatting the pages) (Hodgkinson: paragraph 0015 on page 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Friskel et al. and Hodgkinson before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the control of a browser receiving information from a network of Friskel et al. to include the prevention of an action, taught by Hodgkinson. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to provide a management system that keeps users from conducting harmful or unauthorized actions on data, maintaining data integrity and security.

8. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach similar methods of controlling one window using another window.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (703) 305-0328. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CAO (KEVIN) NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

8 June 2004